

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspro.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/488,180	06/07/1995	WALTER P. CARNEY	40441-CY/JPW	8467
75	90 10/27/2003		EXAM	INER
JOHN P WHITE			HUFF, SHEELA JITENDRA	
COOPER AND	- - -		A DT LINUT	DA DED MUMOED
1185 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK, NY 10036			1642	

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	08/488,180	CARNEY ET AL.
Advisory Action	Examin r	Art Unit
	Sheela J Huff	1642
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this (1) a timely filed amendme	application. A proper reply to a nt which places the application in
PERIOD FOR I	REPLY [check either a) or l	p)]
a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing d		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expir ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY W. 706.07(f).	re later than SIX MONTHS from to AS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTH	ne mailing date of the final rejection. IS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Ottimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37	d of extension and the correspon- of the shortened statutory period office later than three months afte	ding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension for reply originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellan 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 C		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	because:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require furt	ther consideration and/or s	earch (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	e below);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	n in better form for appeal t	y materially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	eling a corresponding num	per of finally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ection(s): <u>none</u> .	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	ld be allowable if submitted	in a separate, timely filed amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: §		n considered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SC	LELY to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendme explanation of how the new or amended claims v		· —
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	S :	
Claim(s) allowed: <u>16-24</u> .		
Claim(s) objected to: none.		
Claim(s) rejected: 25-27.		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on i	is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐	disapproved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statem	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)
10. Other:		
		Sheela J Huff Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1642

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No. 08/488,180

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's main argument is that the references does not teach that the product is detectable in a biological fluid. As stated in the previous action, this property is inherent absent objective evidence. Applicant also argues that range in different while the range of the reference is broader than that of applicant's, as indicated by applicant there is some overlap..